



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/068,638	02/06/2002	Herbert L. Presley	2035449-0001	8092

33591 7590 08/12/2004

MARK J. YOUNG  
50 N. LAURA STREET  
SUITE 3300  
JACKSONVILLE, FL 32202

EXAMINER

BHATTACHARYA, SAM

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2685

5

DATE MAILED: 08/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/068,638

Applicant(s)

PRESLEY ET AL.

Examiner

Sam Bhattacharya

Art Unit

2685

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 06 February 2002 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Drawings***

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the means for converting textual data to speech data must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Claim Objections***

1. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: the term "vide0" in line 6 should be spelled --video--. Appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 2685

2. Claim 7 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 5.

When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

4. Claims 1-9 and 11-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Seligmann (US 6,330,022).

Regarding claims 1 and 19, Seligmann discloses a wireless video conferencing system including a first wireless transceiver 101 communicatively coupled to a base station at 150, the

Art Unit: 2685

first transceiver including a processor for generating first real-time video data, and the first transceiver further including means 101b for playing second real-time video data, and the base station being communicatively coupled to a PSTN network, and a second transceiver 111 communicatively coupled to the network, the second transceiver including a processor for generating the second real-time video data, and the second transceiver further including means 111b for playing the first real-time video data. See FIG. 1, col. 5, lines 63-67 and col. 6, lines 15-49.

Regarding claim 2, Seligmann discloses that the base station is a cellular base station, since the link 102 can be a cellular link.

Regarding claim 3, Seligmann discloses that the base station includes a local access point 160.

Regarding claims 4, 5 and 7, Seligmann discloses that any of the transceivers can be a wireless or wired transceiver. See col. 6, lines 15-20.

Regarding claim 6, Seligmann discloses a mouse and keyboard that can input information to the first transceiver. Moreover, the first can send the information to the second transceiver across the PSTN. See col. 6, lines 1-7.

Regarding claims 8 and 9, Seligmann discloses first and second displays 101a and 111a on the first and second transceivers, respectively, that display routed information.

Moreover, claims 6, 8, 9, 11-18 and 20 recite various intended uses of the wireless conferencing system. The intended uses do not result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and Seligmann. Since Seligmann is capable of performing the intended uses,

Art Unit: 2685

the reference meets the claims. See M.P.E.P. 2114 and *Ex Parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seligmann in view of Brophy et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0055974 A1).

Regarding claim 10, Seligmann fails to disclose means for converting text to speech and means for audibly playing the converted speech data.

However, Brophy et al. disclose a multi-media conferencing system in which an audio server 42a includes a text-to-speech converter and in which speakers in cell phone 20 and computer 22 audibly play the converted speech data. See FIGS. 1 and 3, paragraphs [0041] and

Art Unit: 2685

[0047]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the video conferencing system of Seligmann by including a text-to-speech converter and means for playing converted speech as taught by Brophy et al. to provide users of the system with the alternative of listening to information converted from text documents.

### *Conclusion*

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Sayko (US 6,418,210) discloses a system for communicating via wired or wireless links between computer terminals and an IP network.

Barile (US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0093531 A1) discloses a system for performing video conferencing using mobile phones.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sam Bhattacharya whose telephone number is (703) 605-1171. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward F. Urban can be reached on (703) 305-4385. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2685

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

sb

  
EDWARD F. URBAN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600